

United States District Court
Western District Pennsylvania

DERRICK RANKINE C.A. #04-100 ERIE

VS
Superintendent Folino et al

Affidavit #3 of Derrick Rankine

FILED

'07 FEB -5 AIO:

CLERK
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Plaintiff, Derrick Rankine, swears under oath
and the penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
§ 1746 that the following are true and correct.

(1) That between January 20 2004 to December 20
2004, Plaintiff filed 192 grievances at SCT-Green
and that approximately all the above grievances
were rejected under the "guised" that Plaintiff's
commitment name is allegedly Derrick Rankin, and
not Derrick Rankine.

(b) That Plaintiff appealed all 192 grievances to
Superintendent Folino and all of these grievances
were again rejected under the "guised" in 1(A).

(c) That Plaintiff appealed all 192 grievances to Secre-
tary Jeffery Beard and MS Sharon Bucks the
Chief Grievance Officer of SCT-Camphill, and
that these grievances were again rejected
under the "guised" in 1(A). So, Plaintiff did com-
plete all administrative remedies per ADM DC 80

3.
(2) That on May 27, 2004, Secretary Jeffery

Affidavit #3 DERRICK RANKINE

BEARD visited Plaintiff at SCI-GREEN to discuss and did discussed with Plaintiff "the huge volume of grievances that Plaintiff APPEALED to SCI-Camp Hill between January 20, 2004 to May 27, 2004.

(3) That Plaintiff's ~~DE~~ name is DERRICK Anthony RANKINE and that Plaintiff NEVER USED an ALIAS. SEE DEFENSE EXHIBIT S.C. #1.

(4) That on DECEMBER 20, 2004, Mr. Dan DAVIS admitted the ABOVE to this Court during Plaintiff's restraining order hearing.

(b) That on February 11, 2005, the defendants attempted to murdered Plaintiff and broke both of Plaintiff's wrist and ankles, and confiscated all of Plaintiff's property with the EVIDENCE OF All the ABOVE, IN RETALIATION for pursuing this Civil Action, Civil Action #03-105 ERIE, Civil Action 03-313 ERIE, and Superior Court #555 EDA 2004 and that the defendants have REFUSED to returned to Plaintiff the ABOVE property and EVIDENCE, IN VIOLATIONS OF THE LAWS OF THE United States and Commonwealth of PENNSYLVANIA.

(5) That on January 19, 2007, the defendants returned 11 grievance and grievance APPEALS to

PAGE 3 AFFIDAVIT #3 DERRICK RANKINE

to Superintendent Folino, but the defendants still REFUSED to returned the GRIEVANCE APPEALS to SCI-Camphill and the rest of Plaintiff legal property; IN VIOLATIONS OF THE LAWS OF THE United States and Commonwealth of PENNSYLVANIA.

6 THEREFORE, Plaintiff, object to the "SO CALLED" AFFIDAVITS OF MS. Cindy Watson and MS DIANE Thomas on the grounds that these AFFIDAVITS ARE FALSE and that they do not state on what grounds or IN what way Plaintiff did not ALLEGEDLY completed Plaintiff's Administrative REMEDY, IN VIOLATIONS OF THE LAWS OF THE United States and Commonwealth of PENNSYLVANIA. SEE Nyhuis V RENO 204 F3d 65, 77-78 (Exhaustion is completed if prisoner completed substantial portion of Administrative requirements).

Respectfully Submitted
Derrick Rankine

FU525C
SCI-FAYETTE
P.O. BOX 9999
LABELLE PA 15450

01/20/07.

DEFENCE EXHIBIT S.C. #1



RAYFORD A. MEANS
JUDGE


January 14, 2005

Derrick Rankine
EU 5850
SCI - Greene
175 Progress Drive
Waynesburg, PA 15370

FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
JUDICIAL CHAMBERS

COPY

342 CITY HALL
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107
(215) 686-7322
FAX: (215) 686-7499



555EDA04

RE: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Derrick Rankine
DC # 99-25-075621
MC# 00-03-5488
CP# 00-04-0650

Dear Mr. Rankine:

In accordance with the enclosed order from the Superior Court of Pennsylvania please be advised that a PCRA hearing was denied in the above referenced case. The issues raised in your PCRA petition were without merit.

Please find the enclosed the following:

- (1) Notice Pursuant to Pennsylvania Rule of Criminal Procedure
- (2) Order from the Superior Court of Pennsylvania dated January 10, 2005
- (3) Correspondence dated October 29, 2004, a letter from this Office to Mr. Derrick Rankine which lists the materials previous sent to you.
- (4) Memorandum of Law from Donald Chisholm, II, Esquire
- (5) Commonwealth's Answer
- (6) Opinion - First Judicial District of Pennsylvania Criminal Trial Division

Accordingly there are no PCRA notes of testimony as the request for a PCRA hearing was denied. The above list includes all documents relevant to your request for a PCRA hearing and the subsequent denial of that request.

Respectfully

J. Rayford A. Means

CC: David A. Szewczak,
Prothonotary, Superior Court of Pennsylvania